DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 606 SP 018 845

AUTHOR Baker, Janice M.
TITLE A Description of Teacher Center Proposal Review Processes Conducted by State Education Agencies.
INSTITUTION National Teacher Center Resource Center, Providence, R.I.: Rhode Island State Board of Education, Providence.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 81
CONTRACT 300-78-0408
NOTE 36p.: For related documents, see SP 018 841-842 and SP 018 844-848.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Federal Programs; *Program Evaluation; *Program Proposals; State Departments of Education; *State Standards; *Teacher Centers

ABSTRACT

The National Teacher Center Resource Center conducted a survey of all states and territories to obtain and report information on the state level process for evaluating proposals seeking funds for teacher centers through the federal Teacher Centers Program. The study focused on: (1) describing the proposal developers in terms of agency affiliation and funding cycle; and (2) examining the state review process with respect to timeframe for proposal review, coordination responsibilities for the process, type of review structure and representation of key groups, and use of evaluative criteria. The findings obtained from the survey are analyzed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206606

A DESCRIPTION OF
TEACHER CENTER PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESSES
CONDUCTED BY STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Prepared for:

The National Teacher Center Resource Center
Providence, Rhode Island

Prepared by:

Janice M. Baker
Rhode Island Department of Education
Providence, Rhode Island

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaretta L. Edwards

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

June, 1981

SP 018 845

NATIONAL TEACHER CENTER RESOURCE CENTER

ADVISORY BOARD

Larry Billups, National Education Association

Edward L. Dambruch, Rhode Island State Department of Education

W. Edwin Ellis, National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education

William Hering, Teachers' Centers Exchange, Far West Laboratory

Diane Jones, Teacher Corps, U.S. Department of Education

Alf Langland, Washington State Department of Education

Drew Lebby, Office of Dissemination and Professional Development, U.S. Department of Education

Ervin C. Marsh, Delaware State Department of Public Instruction

Eleanor McMahon, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Joe Minor, Tennessee State Department of Education

Allen A. Schmieder, Teacher Centers Program, U.S. Department of Education

Pat Weiler, American Federation of Teachers, AFT Teacher Center Resource Exchange

Lee Wickline, National Diffusion Network, U.S. Department of Education

STAFF

Edward L. Dambruch, Director

Margaretta L. Edwards, Assistant Director

The work upon which this publication is based was performed pursuant to Contract No. 300-78-0408 of the United States Department of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION 1

METHODOLOGY. 2

Instrumentation 2

Data Collection 3

Data Analysis 3

Study Limitations 3

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS 5

Timeframe for Conducting Proposal Review Process. 5

Source of Proposals and Funding Cycle 6

Local Education Agency Proposals 7
Institution of Higher Education Proposals. 10

Proposal Modification 11

Description of Proposal Review Process. 11

Size of Review Groups. 12
Proposal Review Structures 14
Type and Extent of Group Representation. 15
Proposal Review Criteria 17

Additional Comments 18

SUMMARY. 19

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Documentation Log for Proposal Review Activities

Appendix B: Correspondence

LIST OF TABLES

Page

TABLE 1: Timeframe: Initiation of State-Level Proposal Review Process 6

TABLE 2: Number of LEA Proposals Submitted, According to Funding Cycle. 7

TABLE 3: Comparison Between Number of LEA Proposals Submitted to State and Final Number Sent to Application Control Center Office. 9

TABLE 4: Number of Higher Education Proposals Submitted, According to Funding Cycle 10

TABLE 5: Size of Review Groups. 13

TABLE 6: Proposal Review Structures Used By States. 15

TABLE 7: Extent of Role Group Representation in Thirty-One States Using Multiple Group Review Process 16

INTRODUCTION

This report describes the state Teacher Center proposal review process, one part of a larger effort to document state level Teacher Center activities and services supported by the federal Teacher Centers Program. The basis for the information presented is a survey conducted by the National Teacher Center Resource Center (Resource Center). The survey was designed and sent to all 57 states and territories because of (1) the likelihood that each would receive for review one or more Teacher Center proposals from local education agencies (LEA's) or institutions of higher education (IHE's) for funding through the federal Teacher Centers Program, and (2) the requirement that states review all proposals prior to submitting them to the federal program for review and final decisionmaking. The state is reimbursed $50 for each proposal reviewed and forwarded to the Application Control Center.

The methodology is described and findings are presented in this report according to the focal points of the survey: timeframe for conducting the review process; numbers of proposals received and processed according to the source of the proposals and funding cycle; and description of the process including coordination responsibility, format, level of participation by various groups and criteria used to evaluate proposals. A brief summary is also included.

For the interested reader, available from the Resource Center under separate cover, are additional reports related to the documentation effort.

METHODOLOGY

Instrumentation

A survey (see Appendix A) entitled "Documentation Log for Proposal Review Activities" was designed to collect information on the state level review process for critiquing proposals prepared by eligible groups (LEA's or IHE's) that were seeking funding of Teacher Centers through the federal Teacher Centers Program. The form was piloted at the New England Cluster meeting in October and by mail, involving 10 states, in November, 1980. The revised survey addressed the following items:

- number of proposals received from eligible groups for state-level review;*
- time period during which the proposal review process was conducted;
- source of proposals, namely, LEA's or IHE's;
- funding cycle, with three possibilities:

  a new proposal (which might have come from a center first funded through the federal Teacher Centers Program in 1978),

  a continuation proposal for a Teacher Center initiated in 1979, and

  a continuation proposal for a Teacher Center first funded in 1980;
- type of review process used: committee or other approach;
- coordination responsibilities for the review process;
- type and level of participation by key groups, such as teachers, teacher educators, administrators; and
- use of evaluation criteria for proposal review, in addition to federal criteria.

*This review is required as part of the process for seeking funds from the federal Teacher Centers Program.

Data Collection

The survey, along with correspondence of March 8, 1980 (see Appendix B) from the Resource Center encouraging participation, were mailed on March 10, 1980 to state/territory Teacher Center coordinators of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and the six (6) territories. A response indicating willingness to participate in the proposal review documentation process was requested by March 23, 1981. Reminder notices to 11 states and all the territories were mailed April 11, 1981. Telephone follow-up was also conducted by the Resource Center to increase participation in the data collection effort and, in some instances, to clarify data received.

A total of 49 surveys (86%) were returned representing 48 states and the District of Columbia (hereafter referred to as 49 states). Arizona, Wisconsin and the six territories did not return surveys.

Data Analysis

The data were compiled by state and then aggregated across states on each survey question to obtain frequencies of similar responses to each item. For open-ended questions, based on review of the responses, categories for classifying responses were created to organize the data and findings.

Study Limitations

The reader should bear in mind the limitations of the study. The data collection method was primarily self-reporting by respondents through a written survey. Inherent in this approach are possible errors by the respondent in recording information. To address this problem, data were verified where errors were suspected through telephone follow up with respondents and the federal Teacher Centers Office.

Also of concern is the difficulty for the respondent to capture briefly in writing, primarily in objective format, events which may be complex both in design and delivery. This limitation was minimized, to the extent possible, by conducting telephone calls for clarification of data as needed.

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Timeframe for Conducting Proposal Review Process

The December 8, 1980 federal regulations for Teacher Centers provide authority for a new funding cycle for fiscal year (FY) 1981.* It enables LEA's and IHE's to apply for financial support to develop or to continue the development and operation of Teacher Centers. One of the federal requirements for proposal developers was that proposals first be submitted to the respective state education agencies (SEA's) for review. The comments section of the 1978 regulations states that:

> ...the SEA may offer technical assistance and advice to the applicant at any time before forwarding the proposal to the U.S. (Secretary) of Education.

States, therefore, might suggest modifications or forward the proposals directly to the federal funding source for final review and determination of grant award. The timeframe which was used by states to review proposals is a logical progression from the calendar of key events surrounding that process:

• December 8, 1980	Regulations governing federally-supported Teacher Centers published in the Federal Register
• January 28, 1981	Application package issued from the Application Control Center Office
• January 29, 1981	December regulations revised and reissued
• February 17, 1981	Proposals due to state education agencies for review
• March 10, 1981	Proposals due to the Application Control Center Office

*FY 1981 refers to 1981-82.

Table 1 displays the timeframe during which the state-level review of proposals occurred in the 49 states participating in the survey.

Table 1

TIMEFRAME: INITIATION OF STATE-LEVEL PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

INITIATION OF PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS	NUMBER OF STATES
December, 1980	1
January, 1981	2
February, 1981	41
March, 1981	5

The large majority of states (41) initiated their proposal review activities during February, 1981; the remaining eight states initiated the process either in the months just prior to or after February. Most states (42) reported a span of days for carrying out the process. The seven states reporting a single date all used a committee review process and likely cited the actual day the committee met, whereas other states appear to have reported a time period reflecting preparation and follow-up work as well.

Source of Proposals and Funding Cycle

Proposals were received by states from LEA's (including regional districts and education service agencies) and IHE's and included proposals which reflected the following funding cycles:

- new proposals for FY 1981 (including new proposals from Teacher Centers which were initially started in 1978);
- continuation proposals for Teacher Centers initially receiving federal funds in FY 1979; and

- continuation proposals for Teacher Center projects first funded for FY 1980.

The total number of proposals submitted to the 49 SEA's for review was 238 and the number of proposals finally submitted by the SEA's to the national Application Control Center office was 229. These will be described according to the *source of the applicant* (*LEA* or *IHE*) in the sections which follow. Then, a brief section will describe the extent to which states returned proposals to applicants for modifications prior to submission.

Local Education Agency Proposals. All 49 states received Teacher Center proposals from LEA's, reporting a total of 209 proposals for review by the SEA's. Table 2 displays the number of states receiving proposals with respect to funding cycles and provides a summary of the total number of LEA proposals according to each funding cycle.

Table 2

NUMBER OF LEA PROPOSALS SUBMITTED, ACCORDING TO FUNDING CYCLE

NUMBER OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED	NUMBER OF STATES RECEIVING PROPOSALS ACCORDING TO FUNDING CYCLE		
	New Proposals (including 1978 starts)	Continuation Proposals (initiated in 1979)	Continuation Proposals (initiated in 1980)
1	12	11	8
2	9	3	1
3	6	2	-
4	8	1	-
5	1	-	-
6	5	-	-
8	1	-	-
12	1	-	-
14	1	-	-
23	1	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF PROPOSALS	172	27	10

The large majority (172/82%) of all LEA proposals submitted to SEA's for review were new for the current FY 1981 federal funding cycle. However, 48 (28%) of the 172 new proposals that were received from applicant agencies were initially funded through the federal Teacher Centers Program in FY 1978.*

In addition to a substantial number of new proposals, 37 continuation proposals were submitted, with about two-thirds of these being requests for a third year of funding from LEA's for projects started in FY 1979 through funds from the federal Teacher Centers Program. The remaining one-third of these requests represent continuation funding requests for Teacher Centers that were started in FY 1980 with federal support.

Some states returned proposals to LEA applicants with suggestions for modifications. (This will be discussed in the Proposal Modification section, page 11.) The final number of proposals submitted to the Application Control Center Office, unlike the outcome with IHE proposals, was less than the number originally submitted to the state education agency for review. Table 3 describes the reduction according to funding cycle.

*The records of the National Teacher Centers Office show that some applicants initially funded through the Program in 1978 changed grantees when applying for 1981 funding. The National Office counts such proposals as new submissions, not as submissions from 1978 starts. In one case, a state coordinator reported such a proposal as a 1978 start, thus accounting for a discrepancy of one between the total documented by the National Office and reported to the Resource Center.

Table 3

COMPARISON BETWEEN NUMBER OF LEA PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO STATE AND FINAL NUMBER SENT TO APPLICATION CONTROL CENTER OFFICE

PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS	NUMBERS OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED ACCORDING TO FUNDING CYCLE		
	New Proposals (including 1978 starts)	Continuation Proposals (initiated in 1979)	Continuation Proposals (initiated in 1980)
Initially Submitted to State Agency for Review	172	27	10
Finally Submitted to National Teacher Center Office	163	27	10
Difference	9	0	0

As shown in Table 3, all but nine of the 209 proposals initially sent to SEA's for review were submitted to the National Teacher Center Office. All of the proposals that were not forwarded fell into the "new proposal" funding category.

Based on reasons stated by the respondent or through telephone follow-up by the Resource Center, the following reasons were cited for the nine proposals *not* being submitted for national review:

- proposals were withdrawn by the applicants because they felt they were weak and, in some cases, did not meet federal criteria and therefore would not be funded (3 states, 8 proposals); and
- proposal was not forwarded because of a local issue that was independent of the state's review [illegible]eedback on the proposal (1 state, 1 proposal).

Institution of Higher Education Proposals. A total of 18 states reported receiving 31 proposals from IHE's to establish or continue the development of their Teacher Centers. Table 4 describes the number of states receiving proposals with respect to various funding cycles, as well as the total number of proposals submitted for state review in each of the funding cycle categories.

Table 4

NUMBER OF HIGHER EDUCATION PROPOSALS SUBMITTED, ACCORDING TO FUNDING CYCLE

NUMBER OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED	NUMBER OF STATES RECEIVING PROPOSALS ACCORDING TO FUNDING CYCLE		
	New Proposals (including 1978 starts)	Continuation Proposals (initiated in 1979)	Continuation Proposals (initiated in 1980)
1	11	2	*
2	4	-	-
3	1	-	-
4	-	-	-
5	1	-	-
TOTAL NUMBER OF PROPOSALS	27	2	-

The overwhelming majority of IHE proposals (28 of 31) were new proposals for the current (1981-82) funding cycle, although seven (7) of the 28 were proposals from IHE's that had initially received support

*In FY 1980 only planning grants were awarded, and IHE's were not eligible for these grants.

from the federal Teacher Centers Program in its first (1978) funding cycle and were eligible to re-apply this year for a new grant. Three (3) proposals from two (2) states were received from applicant institutions initially receiving federal support in the 1979-80 funding cycle of the federal Teacher Centers Program.

Although some of the IHE proposals were returned by states to the applicants, the final number of IHE proposals submitted to the Application Control Center Office was identified to the number of proposals submitted to the state education agencies for review.

Proposal Modification

Respondents were asked to indicated if any proposals submitted by LEA's or IHE's for state review were returned for modifications to the applicants. More than half (26) of the 49 states answered affimatively, returning a total of 103 (77%) of the 134 proposals submitted to those SEA's. Fifteen of the 26 states returned all proposals to the applicant agencies, including both LEA's and IHE's whereas the other 11 states returned proposals to only some of the applicants. As previously noted, all 29 of the IHE proposals initially sent to SEA's for review were finally submitted for national review and 200 of the reported 209 LEA proposals were forwarded for national review.

Description of Proposal Review Process

Respondents were asked to describe various characteristics of their proposal review process, including responsibility for coordination of the process, type of review process -- committee or other, participation, and criteria used to evaluate proposals. All of the SEA's coordinated

the proposal review process, with such coordination generally being the responsiblity of the Teacher Center coordinator (46 states) or by the Teacher Center consultant (one state) or staff in the unit in which Teacher Center services are housed (two states).

The sections which follow describe the size of the review groups, proposal review structures used by the states, type and extent of representation of various groups, and use of additional criteria beyond that provided by the national Teacher Center Office to evaluate proposals. Comments from respondents about the proposal review process are also presented.

Size of Review Groups. Forty-eight (48) of the 49 states participating in the survey provided information on the size of the proposal review group for evaluating Teacher Center proposals. Table 5, which displays the findings on group size, shows that more than one-third (17) of the states involved a single review group, namely, the SEA, to evaluate proposals submitted. The majority (31) of the states adopted an approach with representation from multiple groups.

Table 5

SIZE OF REVIEW GROUPS

NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN GROUP	NUMBER OF STATES		TOTALS
	Single Group (SEA) Representation	Multiple Group Representation	
1	6	-	6
2	-	1	1
3	6	7	13
4	2	3	5
5	-	7	7
6	1	2	3
7	1	2	3
8	1	5	6
13-25	-	4	4

Of the 17 states reporting representation solely from the SEA, six states conducted the review through a single reviewer, the state Teacher Center coordinator, six states involved three SEA staff members in the review process, and the remaining five states had from four to eight professionals evaluating the proposals.

When the review process involved representation from more than one group, the size of the group ranged from two reviewers in one state to 25 in another. The most frequently cited sizes for review groups with multiple group representation were three member and five member groups. If representation on the group is not considered, a group size of three participants is the most common choice of the states.

Proposal Review Structures. The approach used by states to carry out the proposal review process was examined to determine format and type of representation. The three formats which emerged from the data analysis were:

- a single reviewer;
- multiple reviewers operating as individual readers and reactors; and
- a committee.

The approaches were further analyzed with respect to representation, where it was determined that in some instances (17) only SEA staff were involved, in some cases (19) representation included the SEA plus other groups, and some SEA's (12) chose not to be involved as a part of the review team (serving solely in a coordinating role). Table 6 shows the number of states using each type of format and representation.

Table 6

PROPOSAL REVIEW STRUCTURES
USED BY STATES

REPRESENTATION	FORMAT			TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES
	Single Reviewer	Multiple Individual Reviewers	Committee	
State Education Agency	6	4	7	17
State Education Agency Plus Other Education Groups	-	5	14	19
Education Groups (excluding State Education Agency)	-	-	12	12
TOTAL NUMBER OF STATES	6	9	33	48

A committee approach was adopted by more than two-thirds (33) of the states, with only six states citing a single reviewer as the approach used. Nine (9) states adopted a process involving multiple (2 or more) individual reviewers; all nine had at least partial if not total SEA representation among the reviewers.

Type and Extent of Group Representation. Role group representation is an important concept in the legislation governing Teacher Centers. The reivew process for evaluating proposals for funding through the federal Teacher Centers Program appears to reflect that philosophy, as shown by the statistics in Table 7.

Table 7

EXTENT OF ROLE GROUP REPRESENTATION IN THIRTY-ONE STATES USING MULTIPLE GROUP REVIEW PROCESS

ROLE GROUP	NUMBER OF STATES	TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	AVERAGE NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
Teachers	26	89	3.4
School Administrators	22	35	1.6
Institution of Higher Education Representatives	21	28	1.3
State Education Agency Staff	19	40	2.1
Teacher Center Representatives	3	10	3.3
Other	2	3	1.5

Teachers were identified through the data analysis as the single group most often represented when the SEA included groups beyond itself in the review process. In terms of actual numbers of people involved, teachers also claimed the highest representation, with 89 members participating in review groups and an average representation of 3.4 members in the 26 states who involved this group.

Also represented in many states were school administrators (22 states), IHE members (21 states), and SEA staff (19 states). However, the extent of representation of each of these groups was much less than that of the teacher groups, as shown by the total and average number of participants in these groups.

Only a few states (3) reported representation from existing Teacher Centers. Those that did involved members of a Teacher Center advisory board or Teacher Center staff members.

Proposal Review Criteria. Through the proposal review survey, information was sought regarding the use of any criteria for proposal review in addition to the federal criteria used for evaluating proposals at the national level. Most states (36) elected to use only the required federal criteria. Of the remaining 13 states that cited the use of additional criteria, only 10 specified what they were. Based on the documented criteria, it was found that:

- three states developed *guidelines* to help the applicants understand and use the federal application packet and regulations; and
- seven states reported development and use of state criteria, which actually go beyond the required federal criteria.

Examples of additional state criteria include:

- adherence to state policies and guidelines relating to training activities, hiring, evaluating and contractual agreements;
- a process for the identification of staff development needs;
- evidence that the state school improvement process was followed;
- an indication that network coordination is sufficiently described; and
- inclusion on the policy board of the county continuing education council (a council which is structured on the same model as the federal Teacher Center, having a majority of teacher representatives).

The additional criteria used by the states appear to reflect an emphasis on sound principles of staff development, and involvement of groups in various ways, such as networking and teacher involvement criteria.

Additional Comments

Several states provided comments which went beyond a description of the process to a reaction to it. The respondents indicated that:

- time allotted to them to conduct the proposal review process was too short (3 states);
- the evaluation of proposals served more as a technical assistance effort than as a means of eliminating proposals (1 state);
- problems with inter-rater reliability were found, and that perhaps SEA's should consider providing training to proposal reviewers prior to undertaking the proposal review process (1 state); and
- reviewers were selected because of the skills and experience with the task.(1 state).

SUMMARY

The Resource Center conducted a survey of all states and territories to obtain and report information on the state level review process for evaluating proposals seeking funds for Teacher Centers through the FY 1981 federal Teacher Centers Program. The study focused on (1) describing the proposal developers in terms of *agency affiliation* and *funding cycle*, and (2) examining the state review process with respect to *timeframe* for proposal review, *coordination responsibilities* for the process, type of *review structure* and *representation* of key groups, and use of *evaluative criteria*.

A total of 49 surveys (86%) were returned, representing 48 states and the District of Columbia. Arizona, Wisconsin and the six territories elected not to participate.

Findings from the survey which describe the proposal developers show that:

- A total of 238 proposals, 209 from LEA's and 29 from IHE's, were submitted to the 49 SEA's for review; of these, 200 LEA proposals and all 29 IHE proposals were forwarded to the national Application Control Center Office.
- The majority (172/82%) of the LEA proposals sent to the 49 SEA's for review were new proposals and, of that number, 48 were initially funded through the federal Teacher Centers Program in FY 1978.
- LEA continuation proposals numbered 37, with about two-thirds of these being proposals initially funded in FY 1979 and the remaining one-third funded in FY 1980 through the federal Teacher Centers Program.

- A total of 29 IHE proposals were sent to 18 SEA's for review; of that number, the overwhelming majority (27) were new proposals; six of the 27 new proposals were from IHE's whose Teacher Center projects were first funded in FY 1978 by the federal Teacher Centers Program.

- Two IHE continuation proposals were submitted, both initially funded in FY 1979.

Findings about the proposal review processes implemented by the SEA's indicated that:

- All of the SEA's coordinated the proposal review process, with such responsibility generally belonging to the Teacher Center coordinator.

- A large majority (41) of the states began their proposal review activities during February, 1981. The most frequent open-ended comment from respondents (3 states) expressed concern about the relatively brief period of time available to conduct the review process.

- More than half (26) of the 29 states returned proposal to LEA's and IHE's with suggested modifications on 103 (77%) of the 134 proposals submitted to those SEA's; fifteen of the 26 states returned all proposals to the applicants. All but nine of the 209 LEA proposals and all 29 IHE proposals initially sent to the SEA's for review were finally submitted for national review.

- More than one-third (17) of the 49 states involved only SEA representatives in the review process, with the majority (31) indicating use of multiple groups.

- The most favored group sizes (20 states) were three and five member groups.

- The committee structure was most often (33 states) selected, with only six states citing a single reviewer as the approach used.

- Teachers was the group most frequently involved in the review process, both in terms of number of states (26) and with regard to actual numbers of teachers (89) involved. Also represented in many states were school administrators (22 states), IHE members (21 states) and SEA staff (19 states).

- The majority of states (36) elected to use only the required federal criteria to evaluate proposals; several states (3) developed guidelines to help applicants understand and use the federal criteria, and others suggested additional state-specific criteria.

APPENDIX A

DOCUMENTATION LOG FOR PROPOSAL

REVIEW ACTIVITIES

DOCUMENTATION LOG FOR PROPOSAL REVIEW ACTIVITIES

This form should be used only for review activities for which states are reimbursed $50 per proposal. Please complete and return this form by March 23, 1981

to: Margaretta L. Edwards, Assistant Director
National Teacher Center Resource Center
235 Promenade Street
Providence, RI 02908

NAME OF STATE: _____ RESPONDENT: _____

A. BACKGROUND

1. Were any federal Teacher Center proposals sent to the State Education Agency for review? (Check one.)

☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, continue on with the questions that follow.

If no, stop here and please return the form as requested.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Time period during which actual review process took place: _____ (Beginning Date) _____ (Ending Date)

B. DESCRIPTION OF SUBMITTED PROPOSALS

3. Use Table I which follows to describe the number of Teacher Center proposals submitted to the State Education Agency for review from (a) Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) and (b) Local Education Agencies (LEA).

TABLE I

FUNDING CYCLE / SOURCE OF PROPOSAL	NUMBER OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO SEA	
	(a) Institutions of Higher Education	(b) Local Education Agencies
New Proposals*		
Continuation Proposals (Initiated in 1979)		
Continuation Proposals (Initiated in 1980)		

*Indicate in the box the number of new proposals that were also 1978 starts. ☐ IHE ☐ LEA

4. Were any proposals returned for modification to Institutions of Higher Education or Local Education Agencies?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, how many? _____

5. Use Table II to describe the final number of proposals that were submitted by the State Education Agency (from Higher Education and Local Agencies) to the U. S. Department of Education. If the same response as Table I, please check the box and go on to Question 6.

☐ Same as Table I.

TABLE II

FUNDING CYCLE / SOURCE OF PROPOSAL	NUMBER OF PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO U.S. DEPT. OF EDUCATION	
	(a) Institutions of Higher Education	(b) Local Education Agencies
New Proposals*		
Continuation Proposals (Initiated in 1979)		
Continuation Proposals (Initiated in 1980)		

*Indicate in the box, the number of new proposals that were also 1978 starts. ☐

TURN

C. PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCESS

6. The type of review process used was: (Check one.)

a. committee review _____

b. other _____

(Specify): _____

_____

7. The review process was:

a. coordinated by: _____ _____
role (e.g., T.C. Coordinator) affiliation (e.g., State Education Agency)

b. included the following number of people, with their roles and affiliations:

Number of People	Role (e.g., Administrators, Teacher Educators, Teachers, Citizens)	Affiliation (e.g., Local School District, University or College, State PTA/PTO)
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

8. In addition to Federal evaluation criteria, were any additional criteria used? (Check one.)

☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, please attach or list the criteria: _____

_____

D. Please add any further information that might be helpful.

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
235 Promenade Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Thomas C. Schmidt, Commissioner

TO: State Teacher Center Coordinators

FROM: Edward L. Dambruch, Director, and Margaretta B. Edwards, Assistant Director, National Teacher Center Resource Center

DATE: October 9, 1980

RE: Documentation of State Teacher Center Activities, 1980-81

The National Teacher Center Resource Center will be documenting activities of state coordinators for Teacher Centers to include the period July 1980 - June 1981.

The purpose for state documentation is to collect information, share ideas and strategies for planning and decision making:

- state sharing and adoption of new ideas
- federal Teacher Center Office information gathering
- Congressional understanding of state role
- interested public understanding of state role.

This year we are looking for full participation of states with federally funded centers. We are requesting that those Coordinators who participate agree to document all activities conducted with federal Teacher Centers funds. (The pilot study last year included participation of 61% of the funded states, but activities describing the use of only 13% of Teacher Center dollars were documented.) This year, we are looking to provide a comprehensive picture of state activities supported with federal funds.

We have considered your feedback gathered at the Annapolis meeting in August, and have attempted to simplify the process by adopting several of your suggestions. Information will be collected as follows:

- due December 15, 1980, will be a brief, "one-time only survey" to provide background information about your state (e.g. personnel assigned to provide services);

- due December 15, 1980, February 15, and May 1, 1981, the basic log form to provide information describing your technical assistance and dissemination activities (reminder notices will be provided two weeks prior to due dates); and

- due February 1, 1981, a "one-time only summary" to describe your proposal review activities.

The data collection approach has been modified to emphasize a more effective "check off" system for easier, less time-consuming response, as suggested by many of you. Yet, it retains the option of providing narrative to further explain activities, if so desired.

We encourage each one of you to participate. As many of you pointed out, it is critically important that the work that you do be recorded to provide necessary information about State participation in teacher centers. Please complete this tear off sheet and return it to me, Margaretta L. Edwards, Assistant Director, National Teacher Center Resource Center, Rhode Island Department of Education, 235 Promenade Street, Providence, RI 02908, by Monday, October 20, 1980.

You will receive a packet of forms that are being piloted in late October. Until then, please keep your notes on activities conducted since July 1.

☐ I agree to participate fully in the State Documentation effort sponsored by the National Teacher Center Resource Center; documenting activities from July 1980 through May 1, 1981.

☐ I am unable to participate in the State Documentation effort sponsored by the National Teacher Center Resource Center.

Name _____

Address _____

_____

_____

Please return by October 20, 1980
to
the National Teacher Center Resource Center

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
235 Promenade Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Arthur R. Pontarelli
Acting Commissioner

TO: Teacher Center State Coordinators with federally funded Teacher Centers

FROM: Margie Edwards, Assistant Director, National Teacher Center Resource Center

DATE: November 25, 1980

RE: 1980-81 State Documentation Forms

The purpose of this memo is to initiate state documentation activities. Thirty-six (36) of the forty-four (44) states having federally funded Teacher Centers have agreed to document all activities conducted with federal Teacher Centers' funds from July 1980 thru June 1981. (See list of participants enclosed.)

New, simplified documentation logs have been piloted with twelve state Coordinators and the Advisory Board to the Resource Center. For those of you participating, your initial responsibilities will be as follows:

- due December 15, 1980, a brief, "one time only survey" to provide background information about your state. (Complete the white legal size sheet enclosed);
- due December 22, 1980, individual logs describing proposal development, technical assistance and dissemination activities completed between July - November. (Complete the pink logs.)

You may also wish to begin documenting activities beginning in December; these logs will be due at a later time.

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate. With such a high percentage of states making this a priority, we anticipate gathering information that will be helpful to you, to the federal Teacher Center office, to Congress and other interested publics.

Please call me at 401/277-6834 if you have any questions.

cc Unfunded State Coordinators
Advisory Board Members, National Teacher Center Resource Center

Enclosures

November 1980

PARTICIPANTS IN 1980-81
STATE DOCUMENTATION ACTIVITIES

National Teacher Center Resource Center

STATE	NAME
Alabama	William C. Berryman
Alaska	J. Kelly Tonsmeire
Arkansas	Morris L. Homes
California	Bill Webster
Connecticut	Marjorie Bradley
District of Columbia	Dr. Marilyn T. Brown
Florida	Jim Parris
Idaho	A. D. Luke
Illinois	Arnette M. Rauschel
Indiana	Patti Shoupe
Kansas	Mary Martin
Kentucky	Joseph T. Clark
Louisiana	Pamela Bollinger-Cox
Maryland	Irving Herrick
Massachusetts	Jeanne M. Paradise
Michigan	Paula Brictson
Minnesota	Judy Wain
Mississippi	Bob McCord
Missouri	Richard L. King
Nebraska	Robert Dyke
Nevada	Lamar Lefever
New Hampshire	Gary Barker
New Jersey	Margaret Griswold
New Mexico	Jim Pierce
New York	Vincent C. Gazzetta
Ohio	C. William Phillips
Oklahoma	Stan Cobb
Oregon	Ray L. Talbert
Pennsylvania	Randall Bauer
South Carolina	Tom Parks
Tennessee	Joe Minor
Texas	Jim L. Kidd
Utah	R. LaMar Allred
Vermont	Henry Bissex
Virginia	E. B. Howerton, Jr.
Washington	Alf Langland

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
235 Promenade Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Arthur R. Pontarelli
Acting Commissioner

TO: Territory Teacher Center Coordinators

FROM: Margie Edwards, Assistant Director, National Teacher Center Resource Center

DATE: April 1, 1981

RE: Documentation Log for Proposal Review Activities

We are about to enter the data from the proposal reviews submitted by the 57 State/Territory Teacher Center Coordinators. At this date, we have not received your completed form.

Please take a few minutes to complete the duplicate form enclosed and return it to the National Teacher Center Resource Center office.

If you have already mailed in the form, please disregard this notice.

Thank you very much.

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
235 Promenade Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Arthur R. Pontarelli
Acting Commissioner

TO: State and Territory Teacher Center Coordinators

FROM: Margaretta L. Edwards, Assistant Director, National Teacher Center Resource Center

DATE: March 10, 1981

RE: Proposal Review Form to document State Teacher Center review activities

While the State Teacher Center proposal review process that you employed is still fresh in your mind, please take (7) seven minutes to complete the enclosed yellow form and return it to me by March 23, 1981.

gc

Enclosure

cc Advisory Board to the National Teacher Center Resource Center

National Teacher Centers Program Acting Director and Staff

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
199 Promenade Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Arthur R. Pontarelli
Acting Commissioner

TO: Kelly Tonsmiere (Ala.), Ralph Ferguson (Ariz.), Kathy Yeates (Calif.), Ervin Marsh (Del.), Davin Tilton (Me.), Lamar Lefever (Nev.), Helen Hartle (NY), Roger Kolsrud (ND), Bill Phillips (Ohio), Norma Roberts (W.Va.), Robert Skeway (Wisc.)

FROM: Margie Edwards, Assistant Director, National Teacher Center Resource Center

DATE: April 1, 1981

RE: Documentation Log for Proposal Review Activities

We are about to enter the data from the proposal reviews submitted by the 57 State/Territory Teacher Center Coordinators. At this date, we have not received your completed from.

Please take a few minutes to complete the duplicate form enclosed and return it to the National Teacher Center Resource Center office.

If you have already mailed in the form, please disregard this notice.

Thank you very much.